

REMARKS

Applicant has added new claims 13-35. No new matter has been added.

The comments of the Applicant below are each preceded by related comments of the Examiner (in small, bold type).

Allowable subject matter

The applicant acknowledges the allowability of claim 6.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

Claims 1-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. ... Regarding claim 1, "wherein the device is operable in a first mode in which the plurality of sub-pixels of a pixel are addressed simultaneously with a data signal and in a second mode in which the sub pixels of a pixel are addressed individually with respective data signals" is not described in such a way that enables one of skill in the art to understand how two different modes of display be in one display device. In those two different modes of display, the TFT's are connected in two different ways.

In the two modes of operation recited in claim 1, the TFT's are not connected in two different ways. Rather, the TFTs are switched differently. The two modes of operation refer to different ways of driving the voltages on the column and row conductors to address the sub pixels. For example, see Applicant's specification at page 6, lines 10-12. The two modes of operation are described in the specification. For example, a first mode of operation is described in the specification at page 7, lines 17-27, and a second mode of operation is described in FIG. 4 and at page 6, line 19 to page 7, line 6. Therefore, Applicant requests that the rejections be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

Claims 1-5, 7, and 9-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Edwards et al. (US 7,230,597).

The applied reference has a common inventor with the instant application. Based upon the earlier effective U.S. filing date of the reference, it constitutes prior art under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). This rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) might be overcome either by a showing under 37 CFR 1.132 that any invention disclosed but not claimed in the reference was

derived from the inventor of this application and is thus not the invention "by another," or by an appropriate showing under 37 CFR 1.131.

As to claim 1, Edwards et al. discloses an active matrix display device comprising an array of pixels a set of row conductors through which rows of pixels are selected (fig. 1, col. 4, lines 64-67),

a set of column conductors through which data signals are supplied to selected pixels (fig. 1, col. 4, line 64 - col. 5, line 13),

each pixel comprising a plurality of sub pixels which sub pixels are each associated with a respective switching transistor for controlling the supply of a data signal to the sub pixel (figs. 1, 8, 9, col. 4, line 64 - col. 5, line 13),

wherein the plurality of sub pixels of a pixel are coupled to a column conductor associated with the pixel via a common switching transistor through which data signals are supplied to the sub pixels (fig. 1), and

wherein the device is operable in a first mode in which the plurality of sub-pixels of a pixel are addressed simultaneously with a data signal (fig. 9, col. 8, lines 44-48) and in a second mode in which the sub pixels of a pixel are addressed individually with respective data signals (fig. 8, col. 8, lines 35-40) (as best understood).

Applicant disagrees. Edwards does not describe and would not have made obvious "wherein the device is selectively operable in a first mode in which the plurality of sub-pixels of a pixel are addressed simultaneously with a data signal and in a second mode in which the sub pixels of a pixel are addressed individually with respective data signals," as recited in amended claim 1.

In FIG. 8 and column 8, lines 35-39, Edwards discloses a drive scheme in which plural address lines 14 are provided for each row separately controlling a plurality of thin film transistors 12 of a pixel, and the address lines 14 are individually selected to deliver each successive bit to the pixel sequentially. Edwards does not describe or suggest that a display device using drive scheme of FIG. 8 is selectively operable in two modes.

In FIG. 9 and column 8, lines 50-59, Edwards discloses a way to transfer data to each of the capacitance 90 - 93. Initially the first, second, third and fourth address lines 80, 81, 82, 83 are all selected and data is supplied along column line 16 to be written to fourth capacitance 93. Then, the fourth address line 83 is deselected and a further bit of data applied to column line 16 to be written to third capacitance 92. After deselecting the third address line 82, the second capacitance 91 can be written. Finally, the second address line 81 can be deselected, leaving only the first address line 80 selected and data is written to the first capacitance 90. In the arrangement shown in FIG. 9 of Edwards, when the data is written to the fourth capacitance 93,

the data is also written to the first to third capacitances. However, this is merely part of the process of transferring data to each of the capacitances 90-93. Edwards does not describe or suggest that a display device using the arrangement of FIG. 9 is "selectively operable" in two modes, the first mode being such that the plurality of sub-pixels are addressed simultaneously with a data signal and the second mode being such that the sub pixels of a pixel are addressed individually with respective data signals.

Claims 2-12 are patentable for at least the same reasons as those applied to claim 1. Moreover, these claims add additional distinctive features. For example, claim 2 recites "drive means for providing data signals to the column conductors and switching signals to the row conductors, and wherein the drive means is operable in the first mode to switch the switching transistors associated with the sub pixels of a pixel at the same time so as to supply a data signal on the associated column conductor to each sub pixel, and wherein the drive means is operable in the second mode to switch the switching transistors associated with the sub pixels of the pixel selectively in sequence such that data signals on the associated column conductor are supplied to respective sub pixels."

Any circumstance in which the applicant has addressed certain comments of the examiner does not mean that the applicant concedes other comments of the examiner. Any circumstance in which the applicant has made arguments for the patentability of some claims does not mean that there are not other good reasons for patentability of those claims and other claims. Any circumstance in which the applicant has amended or canceled a claim does not mean that the applicant concedes any of the examiner's positions with respect to that claim or other claims.

Applicant : Martin J. Edwards
Serial No. : 10/528,255
Filed : March 17, 2005
Page : 14 of 14

Attorney's Docket No.: 14509-0128US1 / P080483SEXCLUS

Please apply \$130 for the Petition for Extension of Time fees and \$844 for the excess claims fee, and any other charges or credits to Deposit Account No. 06-1050, referencing attorney docket no. 14509-128US1.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 11/25/2008

Rex I. Huang
Rex I. Huang
Reg. No. 57,661

Fish & Richardson P.C.
225 Franklin Street
Boston, MA 02110
Telephone: (617) 542-5070
Facsimile: (617) 542-8906